REMARKS

Claims 1-37 are currently pending in the subject application and are presently under consideration. Claims 1, 2, 5, 10, 12, 14-18, 24, and 31-37 have been amended as shown on pp. 3-8 of the Reply. In addition, claim 13 is cancelled as indicated on p. 4. Furthermore, the Specification is amended as indicated on p. 2 of the Reply.

The Examiner is thanked for courtesies extended during an interview conducted on May 29, 2008. The focus of the interview was on proposed claim amendments to overcome the 35 U.S.C. §101, §102(e) and §103(a) rejections. It was agreed that amending claims 1, 18, 31 and 37 to recite hardware (*e.g.*, computer-readable storage media, processing hardware) would be sufficient to overcome the §101 rejection. In addition, claim amendments were discussed to traverse the 35 U.S.C. §102(e) and §103(a) rejections. It was pointed out that the cited art did not read on aspects of the claims as amended. One such aspect was a schema component that includes a representation of domain terminology that is not native to an API of a host application coupled with a mapping component that maps the representation to an API contruct. A resulting map of the representation and API construct can enable the host application to operate on the non-native domain terminology, for instance. The Examiner stated that these amendments would likely traverse the currently cited references. The interview of May 28, 2008 was attended by Matthew F. Clapper (Reg. No. 62,216) and Examiner Kimbleann C. Verdi.

Favorable reconsideration of the subject patent application is respectfully requested in view of the comments and amendments herein.

I. Objection to Drawings

The drawings are objected to as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(4) because reference character "914" has been used to designate both HDD Internal and HDD External of Figure 9. The drawings are objected to as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(5) because they do not include the following reference sign(s) mentioned in the description: "712", page 14, line 17.

A replacement drawing sheet is provided with this Reply; Fig. 9 of the replacement drawing sheet should replace the original Fig. 9 as filed. The replacement drawing sheet labels the internal HDD as 914A and the external HDD as 914B. In addition, a portion of the Specification relating this aspect of Fig. 9 is replaced with a substitute paragraph, as indicated

above. Furthermore, the portion of the Specification including the reference sign 712 is replaced with a substitute paragraph which does not include this reference sign, as indicated above. It is submitted that no new matter is added to the Specification or drawings with these replacement paragraphs and drawing sheet. Withdrawal of this objection is respectfully requested.

II. Objection of Claims 13 and 14 Under 37 CFR 1.75(c)

Claims 13 and 14 is objected to under 37 CFR 1.75(c), as being of improper dependent form for failing to further limit the subject matter of a previous claim. Claim 13 is cancelled with this Reply. Further, claim 14 is amended and re-written in independent form to address the Examiner's concerns. It is therefore respectfully requested that this objection be withdrawn.

III. Objection of Claims 31-36

Claims 31-36 are objected to because of minor informalities. Amendments to claims 31-36 are provided with this Reply to address the Examiner's concerns with regard to this objection. It is therefore respectfully requested that this objection be withdrawn.

IV. Rejection of Claims 1-23 and 31-37 Under 35 U.S.C. §101

Claims 1-23 and 31-37 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. Independent claims 1, 18, 31 and 37 have been amended to address the Examiner's concerns with regard to this rejection. It is therefore respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

V. Rejection of Claims 1-7, 12, 15-18, 21-22, 24-34 and 37 Under 35 U.S.C. §102(e)

Claims 1-7, 12, 15-18, 21-22, 24-34 and 37 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Fry, et al. (US 2003/0163603 A1, hereinafter referred to as Fry). Withdrawal of this rejection is requested for at least the following reason: Fry does not teach or suggest each and every element of claims 1-7, 12, 15-18, 21-22, 24-34 and 37.

> For a prior art reference to anticipate, 35 U.S.C. §102 requires that "each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference." *In re Robertson*, 169 F.3d 743, 745, 49 USPQ2d 1949, 1950 (Fed.

Cir. 1999) (*quoting Verdegaal Bros., Inc. v. Union Oil Co.*, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987)).

In general, Fry discloses a schema parser that can be used in data binding to create a schema object model when given an XML schema. The schema object model can generate Java classes that correspond to types and elements in the schema. Mapping between the schema and Java classes, and *vice versa*, can be written to a type mapping directory. The mappings can be utilized to generate XML from a Java object tree and further to populate a Java class when given an XML instance matching the schema object model.

In contrast to the teaching of Fry, the subject application, in at least one aspect, provides a programming model that allows a developer to create a schema and then map elements of the schema to constructs understood by a host API. Thus, general purpose host APIs can be mapped to new programming models based on a user defined schema. The schema enables a user to communicate with the host application utilizing user-centric terminology pertinent to a problem being solved in the host application. The user-centric terminology need not be understood natively by the general purpose APIs provided with the host application. Thus, as recited in claim 1 as amended, a system can comprise *a schema component that includes a schema element representative of domain terminology* ***of a problem to be solved in a host application, the domain terminology is not native to … the host application***. Further, the system can comprise *a mapping component that maps the schema element to a construct of an API of the host application* ***and enables the host application to operate on the [non-native]*** *domain terminology*. Accordingly, claim 1 provides an interface to a host application that enables a user to input non-native terms pertinent to a problem solved in the application. By way of the mapping of these terms to constructs of the API, the host application can operate on these non-native terms. Thus, a user can provide human-centric terminology to the host application, which can operate on the terminology in a native manner. This aspect is not taught or suggested by Fry.

Further to this point, claim 5 recites, in part, *a generation component that generates a data programming model and a view programming model that are automatically connected to each other* via *the binding,* ***the view programming model provides an interface … by which the domain terminology Is operated on by the host application***. Since the domain terminology is non-native to the host application, a significant advantage is provided to a user, as discussed above. Fry does not teach or suggest these aspects of claim 5, and therefore cannot provide the

advantage of an interface with which non-native terminology can be provided to an application for the application to operate on. Claims 18, 24 and 37 recite similar elements, at least in part, and thus are not taught or suggested by Fry. Furthermore, at least because dependent claims 2-4, 6, 7, 12, 15-17, 21, 22, and 25-34 incorporate the elements of their respective independent claims, Fry does not teach or suggest these claims either. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

VI. Rejection of Claims 8-11, 13-14, 19-20, 23, 30 and 35-36 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 8-11, 13-14, 19-20, 23, 30 and 35-36 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Fry, et al. (US 2003/0163603 A1) in view of Evans (US 2003/0159030, hereinafter referred to as Evans). This rejection should be withdrawn for at least the following reason: Fry and Evans, either alone or in combination, do not disclose or suggest each and every limitation set forth in the subject claims.

> If a reference is cited that requires some modification in order to meet the claimed invention or requires some modification in order to be properly combined with another reference and such modification destroys the purpose or function of the invention disclosed in the reference, one of ordinary skill in the art would not have found a reason to make the claimed modification. *In re Gordon*, 733 F.2d 900, 221 USPQ 1125 (Fed. Cir. 1984).

Evans teaches transporting web page data in a secure manner over a network. Some components of the web page are stored in XML data islands. Sensitive data stored in such islands can be encrypted using an encryption routine. Once the data islands containing the sensitive data are encrypted, the web page can be transmitted over the network. The encryption routine is chosen based on the sensitivity of the data and an overhead cost required to encrypt and transmit the data.

Evans is silent with respect to elements of independent claims 1, 14, 18, 24 31 and 37 as discussed above. For instance, Evans does not teach or suggest a schema component that includes a schema element representative of domain terminology of a problem to be solved in a host application, where such domain terminology is not native to an API associated with the host application, and mapping the schema element to a construct of the API of the host application,

enabling the host application to operate on the domain terminology, as recited in claim 1. Further, Evans does not teach or disclose similar elements recited in claims 14, 18, 24, 31 and 37. Thus, Evans is unable to cure the deficiencies of Fry with respect to claims 8-11, 13, 19, 20, 23, 30, 35 and 36, which incorporate the elements of their respective base claims. Thus neither Fry nor Evans teach or suggest each and every element of the claims of the subject application. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested at least for the foregoing reasons.

CONCLUSION

The present application is believed to be in condition for allowance in view of the above comments and amendments. A prompt action to such end is earnestly solicited.

In the event any fees are due in connection with this document, the Commissioner is authorized to charge those fees to Deposit Account No. 50-1063 [MSFTP551US].

Should the Examiner believe a telephone interview would be helpful to expedite favorable prosecution, the Examiner is invited to contact applicants' undersigned representative at the telephone number below.

Respectfully submitted,

AMIN, TUROCY & CALVIN, LLP

/Himanshu S. Amin/
Himanshu S. Amin
Reg. No. 40,894

AMIN, TUROCY & CALVIN, LLP
24TH Floor, National City Center
1900 E. 9TH Street
Cleveland, Ohio 44114
Telephone (216) 696-8730
Facsimile (216) 696-8731